



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

8
Election

Cyber

11-23-98

In re Application of:

Jean-Paul MARDON et al.

Serial No. 09/000,104

Art Unit: 3641

Filed: April 20, 1998

Examiner: M. Lattig

For: TUBE FOR A NUCLEAR
FUEL ASSEMBLY AND
METHOD FOR MAKING
SAME

Atty Docket: 336/183

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated November 4, 1998.

It appears that the Examiner has incorrectly characterized claims 1 to 4 as relating to an apparatus, whereas in fact these claims are product claims.

Applicants provisionally elect product claims 1 to 4, while traversing the Examiner's restriction requirement.

The Examiner is reminded that the present application is a PCT "national phase" application, and that hence the unity of invention requirements of PCT Rule 13 are applicable. MPEP 1893.03(d) states that

RECEIVED
NOV 19 1998
1998 11 19 14:41

unity exists when a process is "specially adapted" for manufacture of the product if the claimed process inherently produces that claimed product. The discussion further explains that "[t]he expression 'specially adapted' does not imply that the product could not also be manufactured by a different process."

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner's restriction requirement be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard Wiener, Reg. No. 18,741
Pollock, Vande Sande & Amernick, R.L.L.P.
1990 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036-3425
Telephone: 202-331-7111

Date: November 18, 1998